DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 706 HE 022 847

AUTHOR Crosson, Patricia
TITLE Public Service at Public Colleges. Mission and Management. AASCU Studies 1985/3.
INSTITUTION American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-88044-113-5
PUB DATE Nov 85
NOTE 32p.; Based on 1980 study by Kurt Smith.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Involvement; Higher Education; Institutional Mission; Organization; Organizational Objectives; *Public Policy; *Public Service; *School Community Relationship; *State Colleges; State Universities

ABSTRACT

A description of the current status of academic public service in American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) institutions, focusing on those organizational aspects and policy variables that pertain to colleges having a strong public service emphasis is presented. Information is provided on a study undertaken in 1980 of public service in AASCU institutions. It examined the current status of mission, program, and organization of state colleges and universities with respect to academic public service, organizational differences, and particular organizational adaptations of structure, policy, and procedure to accommodate academic public service. Topics regarding current status include mission and goals for public service, program variables, and organization and rewards for service. Organizational differences associated with public service emphasis are discussed according to model differences, proportional differences, similarities, and strategies for a stronger service organization. Recommendations for enhancing the public service orientation are offered as follows: provide leadership; develop and promulgate a statement on public service policy for the institution; invest in the service mission; reward public service activity; and make an organizational commitment to the service mission. Tables are included. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310706

SCUDIES

aascu℠

1985/3

Public Service at Public Colleges:

Mission and Management

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

American Association
of State Colleges and Universities

HE 022 847

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public Service at Public Colleges

Mission and Management

Patricia Crosson

AASCU Studies 1985/3
November 1985

based on study conducted in 1980
by Kurt Smith

© 1985 by American Association of State Colleges
and Universities
One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192

Library of Congress Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Crosson, Patricia H.

Public service at public colleges.

(AASCU studies; 1985/3)
"November 1985."
1. State universities and colleges-United States-Public services. 2. Interorganizational relations-United States. 3. American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
I. Title. II. Series
LB2329.5A43 1985/3 [LB2331.44] 378.053 s 85-26842
ISBN 0-88044-113-5 [378'.053]

Contents

Foreword
3

Executive Summary
4

Study
7

Foreword

There appears to be universal agreement that teaching, research, and public service constitute higher education's "trivium." Only recently, however, has any significant attention been given to the fuller ramifications of the third element, public service. One of the more substantial efforts to fill the gap was the doctoral dissertation of Kurt Smith, who formerly directed a number of urban higher education projects at AASCU. Patricia Crosson, who recently authored an ERIC report on public service, presents here a review of the data contained in Kurt Smith's dissertation.

AASCU considers essential the wider recognition of the impact that public-service activities have on both the communities served and the institutional resources required. As Patricia Crosson observes, the data collected by Kurt Smith provide good indications of that impact. At the same time, not only are newer data needed, but there also remain unanswered questions about policies affecting public-service programs. By means of this publication AASCU hopes to stimulate discussion and response to both of these needs. A part of AASCU's response is to collaborate with Patricia Crosson in the studies she is undertaking during her sabbatical.

Much has recently been spoken and written about the relationship between the vitality of this nation and both the actual and potential contributions of our colleges and universities. Drawing more effectively on the talents, skills, and knowledge through public-service programs, formal and informal, promises many fruitful outcomes. Being able to harvest such fruit depends on our more complete understanding of how public service actually coordinates with the regular operations and responsibilities of our campuses. It is our hope that this publication will help to increase that understanding.

Harold Delaney
Executive Vice President
AASCU

Executive Summary

Over the years, the mission of public service in higher education has come to mean direct programmatic relationships between institutions of higher education and external groups for the purpose of bringing knowledge resources more directly and effectively to bear on the identification, understanding, and resolution of public problems. Public expectations for services from colleges and universities have grown dramatically, keeping pace with the growth in the public investment in postsecondary education. Institutions of higher education have increasingly recognized service as an obligation and have expanded the amount and range of their services.

A study of academic public service in AASCU institutions shows that these institutions have a particularly strong tradition and record of achievement in public service. Most AASCU members recognize public service as an important institutional obligation. They have developed specific criteria for involvement in public-service projects; allow many academic support services to be used for public service; and use a variety of fiscal incentives to further the service mission. AASCU institutions vary in their degree of emphasis on public service, but there are many innovative and exemplary public-service practices to be found among AASCU members.

It will not be easy to continue to strengthen the public-service mission in the years ahead. Difficult choices among academic priorities, resource distributions, and policy directions have to be made. Meeting the demand for improved public service will require strong leadership, close attention to a range of institutional policies and practices, and adjustments in organizational structures and reward systems.

The Study

Nearly all colleges and universities include service in their formal statements of institutional mission and purpose. Although the language institutions use differs, the basic concepts and commitments are similar. First, "service" is used to describe the contributions to society that result from teaching, research, and scholarly activity. Second, "service" connotes the acceptance of an obligation and responsibility to help solve or ameliorate social problems. Finally, the mission of service implies recognition of the social importance of knowledge. Over the decades, scholars, politicians, and community and business leaders have noted the crucial relationships between knowledge and social, political, and economic progress. They have recognized the indispensible role of colleges and universities of all types in the production, dissemination, and application of knowledge. Public service in higher education has come to mean direct programmatic relationships between institutions of higher education and external groups for the purpose of bringing knowledge resources more directly and effectively to bear on the identification, understanding, and resolution of public problems.

Service relationships exist between colleges and universities of all types and external groups of all types, including public and private organizations at local, state, regional, and national levels. The particular configuration of relationships for any given institution will reflect its basic nature—public or private, college or university—as well as its size, location, and the interests and commitments of its administration, faculty, staff, and student body. While a community college or branch campus may develop service relationships with nearby business and community organizations, a public state university may concentrate on state government and state agencies, and a private research university will attend to federal agencies and larger, perhaps multinational corporations. Thus in their public-service activities, colleges and universities display a healthy diversity that has become a hallmark of American higher education.

The range of problems and issues addressed through service relationships between colleges and universities and external agencies is similarly extensive and diverse and reflects the entire range of human concerns. The kinds of problems addressed are not as directly related to institutional type but are defined to some extent by the nature and range of academic programs and faculty capabilities within a given institution. For example, a university with many professional schools is likely to have public-service activities focusing on the range of public problems that can be effectively addressed by the corresponding professional schools.

In contrast, a small college may focus on only one or two problem areas. As public concerns change over time, the service activities of colleges and universities shift accordingly. At present, many colleges and universities are focusing their public-service efforts on helping both government and industry foster regional economic renewal.

Public-service activities in higher education take many different forms. The most prevalent continues to be training programs and special seminars and workshops in which faculty expertise is shared and dialogue encouraged. Other popular forms include applied research, technical assistance, personnel exchanges, and other specially designed programs. On most campuses, a number of special institutes and bureaus have been created.

Expectations for services from colleges and universities have grown dramatically and have kept pace with the large public investment in higher education. Government agencies at federal, state, and local levels have enlisted the help of colleges and universities—both public and private—in efforts to address complex social problems. Civic groups have looked to their educational neighbors for help with community renewal and for an array of cultural and intellectual resources. Private businesses and industrial firms expect higher education services relating not only to manpower development and human capital formation but also to new product ideas and technologies. As the public has come to recognize the interdependence of current social, economic, and political problems, the contributions of colleges and universities have become ever more important.

Higher education institutions have responded to requests for expert advice and service and to demands resulting from their unique role as knowledge providers by increasing their commitments to public service. Public colleges and universities in particular have recognized service as a basic responsibility, an obligation directly related to their expectations for public support. But effective realization of the public-service mission in higher education has not been easy. Finding the resources needed for effective service delivery is a long-standing but increasingly pressing problem. Decisions about which external groups and which public problems are most deserving of attention and energy are extremely difficult to make as more and more external groups request (or demand) attention. Choices among the many possible *forms* of delivery are equally difficult. Balancing obligations to teaching, scholarly inquiry, and service has been a problem for both institutions and individual faculty members. Colleges and universities have often failed to develop adequate

mechanisms for linking programs and services to external agencies. It has long been acknowledged that internal campus priorities and reward systems do not recognize the contributions of faculty members to public service.

Member institutions of American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) have long, proud traditions of public service. They have extensive programmatic relationships with civic, cultural, and philanthropic organizations; with local, state, and national governmental entities; and with business and industrial firms. They have sought through service to bring knowledge and professional expertise to bear directly on the resolution of public problems and to contribute to the well-being of society. Specialized colleges, teachers' colleges, comprehensive state colleges and universities, and regional state universities share a commitment to professional instruction, interpretive scholarship, and applied research and development, which in turn strengthens and reinforces their shared commitment to community-oriented public service. AASCU seeks to help its member institutions articulate and implement their public-service missions. In this function, as in teaching and scholarship, AASCU seeks to provide information and guidance. Over the years AASCU has sponsored many special studies and policy papers on public service.

Based on a study of academic public service sponsored by AASCU, this booklet will describe the current status of academic public service in AASCU institutions, focusing on those organizational aspects and policy variables that pertain to colleges having a strong public-service emphasis, and will make recommendations for enhancing the public-service orientation.

Description of Study

In 1980, Kurt Smith, then Special Projects Coordinator of AASCU, undertook a comprehensive study of public service in AASCU institutions.[1] The study examined the current status of mission, program, and organization of state colleges and universities with respect to academic public service; organizational differences that might be attributed to the acceptance of academic

[1]Kurt Bruce Smith, "A Descriptive Analysis of Certain Mission, Program and Organizational Variables with Respect to the Academic Public Service Function of Selected State Colleges and Universities," Ph.D. Dissertation, George Washington University, 1982.

public service as an institutional responsibility; and particular organizational adaptations of structure, policy, and procedure to accommodate academic public service.

In October 1980, AASCU President Allan Ostar sent a memorandum and questionnaire to the 338 AASCU member presidents and chancellors. They were asked to participate in the study and to forward the questionnaire to the person having major responsibility for academic public service at the institution. Respondents were asked to complete the 96-item questionnaire and to forward copies of campus documents related to public service. Two hundred and fifty-five colleges and universities, or 75 percent, responded to the request.

The questionnaire included items on the posture of the institution toward public service as a mission and function; on program characteristics including types of service activities, clients served, and community concerns addressed; and on organizational arrangements, policies, and practices for managing public-service programs. Respondents were asked to send such documents as mission statements; guidelines or criteria for sponsorship of service programs; inventories or directories of service activities; policy statements governing student participation in service programs; brochures and reports describing special institutes, centers, or bureaus for service; and fiscal and personnel policies pertaining to academic public service.

Analysis of the responses provides a picture of the current status of public service in AASCU institutions. Comparison of those institutions placing greater emphasis on public service with those placing less emphasis on it suggests organizational differences in accommodation to academic public service. A closer look at these differences also suggests possible structural arrangements, policies, and practices for consideration by those institutions interested in a stronger emphasis or reinvigoration of their public-service mission. It should be noted at the outset, however, that AASCU institutions are more alike in goal orientation, program emphasis, and arrangements for service than they are different.

This booklet will first describe the current status of public service in these institutions, followed by some organizational differences, and then will offer some recommendations for improvement.

Current Status

Mission and Goals for Public Service

Table 1 summarizes the findings of the Smith study on mission and goals for all responding AASCU institutions. Nearly all AASCU institutions recognize academic public service as an area of institutional responsibility in their mission statements. A majority of AASCU institutions describe academic public service as one of their integral functions, together with teaching and research. A smaller number of AASCU institutions consider it subordinate to teaching and research.

Table 1. Mission and Goals for Academic Public Service in AAASCU Institutions

	Number of Institutions N = 255	*Percent of Total*
1. Academic public service is described as an area of institutional responsibility in mission statement.	234	92
2. Academic public service is recognized in mission statement:		
• as an integral function on a par with teaching and research	149	58
• as a subordinate function to teaching and research	49	19
3. The posture of the administrative leadership toward academic public service can be characterized as follows:		
• leadership encourages faculty and staff activity as institutional representatives	82	32
• leadership considers service an institutional responsibility and has initiated changes to accommodate	103	56

Respondents to the survey included the AASCU institution administrative officers with responsibility for academic public-service programs. Smith asked the respondents to choose the statement that best characterized the posture of the institution's administrative leadership toward academic public service. The question was intended to get beyond the rhetoric of mission statements to the reality of institutional priorities. Respondents were asked to choose from the following four statements, ranging from a negative to a strongly supportive leadership posture toward public service:

- "has evidenced no interest or commitment to academic public service as an institutional function"
- "has not emphasized public service, but has permitted individual faculty/staff entrepreneurial activity"
- "has encouraged faculty and staff to undertake public service projects, and has considered them to be institutional representatives in such undertakings"
- "has viewed academic public service to be an integral part of the institution's functioning, and has initiated organizational arrangements to accommodate academic public service as an institutional responsibility."

As indicated in Table 1, most respondents characterized their institution's leadership as either most supportive or very supportive. Although a positive response is predictable from administrators with responsibilities for public service, the large number of positive responses does testify to a strong affirmation of public service among the leadership of AASCU institutions. This finding is consistent with earlier studies describing AASCU member colleges and universities as premier public-service institutions.[2]

Program Variables

The findings of the Smith study on program variables are summarized in Table 2. More than half of AASCU institutions do not have formal criteria governing conditions under which they will take on academic public-service projects. However, some considerations consistently figure into such decisions. Among the four possible considerations presented in the survey, respondents indicated that the most important factor is perceived compatibility of the service activity with the institutional mission. Most AASCU institutions also consider the interests of faculty and staff members and try to assess the potential for success. More than half of all AASCU institutions consider external pressures and demands

[2]Fred Harcleroad et al., *The Regional State Colleges and Universities Enter the 1970's* (Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1973).

a major factor as well, but it is noteworthy that internal considerations play a stronger role than external ones.

Smith provided a list of fourteen community concerns and public problems that could be addressed through public service and asked respondents to indicate the level of emphasis placed on each in their institution during the preceding two years. Respondents could indicate more emphasis, less emphasis, or none. Smith's findings show that, consistent with the goals and missions of AASCU institutions, the major concerns and problems addressed through academic public services are those related to education. In addition, AASCU institutions are concerned about cultural enrichment, health and human services, energy, and environmental resources. It should be noted, however, that the list of problems and concerns presented by Smith reflect those appearing at the top of the public agenda during the 1970s, and institutions might address different problems and issues today. For example, Smith did not include items related to economic development and technology, two issues of keen interest today.

Smith categorized academic public-service activities into three forms—training, applied research, and technical assistance—and asked respondents to estimate the percentage of activity over the preceding two years for each form of service. "Training" included such activities as conferences, seminars, workshops, short courses, personnel exchanges, and lecture series. "Applied research" included policy and technical studies analyzing action alternatives, and "technical assistance" included consultancies, reference services, program development, clinical services, data processing, and other means of lending college facilities and services to the community. As shown in Table 2, most academic public-service activity in AASCU institutions takes the form of training programs. However, AASCU institutions also engage in both applied research and technical assistance.

Many AASCU institutions participate in one or more consortial arrangements with other higher education institutions, government agencies, or other community organizations having a public-service function. Although some respondents described their consortial arrangements, there was no discernible pattern of typical arrangements.

Higher education institutions often establish special organizational units such as institutes or centers for more effective and efficient delivery of public service. These units parallel the traditional academic structures of departments, schools, and colleges and have clearly defined service, or research and service, responsibilities. Anticipating that AASCU colleges and universities

Table 2. Public Service Program Variables in AASCU Institutions

	Number of Institutions N = 255	*Percent of Total*
1. Does the institution have formal criteria governing conditions for taking on public-service projects:		
• yes	84	33
• no	171	67
2. Major factors in decision to take on public-service projects:		
• compatibility with institutional mission	219	86
• interests of faculty and staff mem-	208	82
• estimation of capability to produce successful results	208	82
• community pressures and demands	147	58
3. Public problems and community concerns addressed through public-service programs:		
• education	225	88
• cultural enrichment	188	74
• health/human services	184	72
• energy	169	66
• environmental/natural resources	165	65
4. Percent of public service effort devoted to		
• training programs		64
• technical assistance		24
• applied research programs		13
5. Participation in consortial arrangements with other institutions having public-service function:	153	60
• one consortium	78	30
• two consortia	51	20
• more than two consortia	15	6
6. Special-purpose centers, institutes, bureaus for public service:		
• 0	55	22
• 1-5	132	52
• 6-10	28	11
• 11 +	14	6
7. Has centers/institutes that are		
• standard	105	41
• adaptive	121	48
• shadow	62	24
8. Students are involved in service learning activities under the auspices of academic department.	106	42

would have created such special-purpose, public-service institutes, centers, or bureaus, Smith asked respondents to indicate the number of such units currently in operation and to select the statement most closely describing them. The statements were drawn from higher education literature and categorized such structures as "standard," "adaptive," or "shadow." "Standard" structures have a permanent professional staff, a management hierarchy, a central office, and an annual "hard-money" budget. "Adaptive" structures are characterized by a small permanent staff, the occasional use of professional personnel from throughout the institution, and a budget largely dependent on contracts and grants from outside sources. "Shadow" refers to those centers or institutes having no permanent staff, budget, or office facilities but providing an opportunity for faculty members from different departments to work together. As shown in Table 2, most institutions do have special-purpose institutes, centers, or bureaus. Typically, AASCU institutions have between one and five such centers or institutes. Many have a "standard" structure. Others have an "adaptive" structure. Frequently, the same institution will have both "standard" and "adaptive" centers. Few AASCU institutions have "shadow" structures.

Most AASCU institutions provide opportunities for students to become involved in public-service programs through service-learning activities for which academic credit is awarded. Generally, student participation is governed by departmental policy rather than institution-wide policy.

Organization and Rewards for Service

Table 3 presents the study findings on organizational matters and incentives for academic public-service activity. Smith asked how many academic and professional personnel were assigned responsibility for the administration of academic public service programs at institutional, school or college, departmental, and institute or center levels. Although the responses varied to some extent among levels, most AASCU institutions assign the responsibility for the administration of academic public-service programs to a single individual with institution-wide responsibilities.

Moreover, the administration of public-service programs is considered to be a part-time responsibility for the designated official. Surprisingly, few AASCU institutions have established formal governance committees charged with responsibility for recommending academic public-service policies and programs. Where such committees exist, however, they have responsibility for recommending institution-wide policy.

Smith asked respondents to indicate which of ten instructional and administrative services were also used to support academic public-service programs and to stipulate whether they were used regularly, infrequently, or not at all. As shown in Table 3, close to half of responding AASCU institutions allow conference facilities to be used regularly for academic public-service programs, while more than 100 allow media centers to be used frequently. Many other institutions use these same two facilities less frequently. University computer centers, library reference services, secretarial assistance, information systems on external funding sources, the campus press, telephone WATS lines, and the assistance of the campus grants information officer are additional support services used regularly by public-service programs in many institutions, and used somewhat less frequently in many others. Clearly, AASCU institutions commit extensive institutional resources to public-service programs.

Smith asked respondents to indicate the sources of the funds used to support public-service programs by estimating the percentage derived from the college operating budget; from special fees, registrations, or subscriptions charged for services; from federal grants and contracts; from state, county, or municipal contracts; or from foundation grants. Most AASCU institutions support their public-service programs with funds from a variety of sources. Typically, one-third of the total funds are derived from special fees, registrations, or conference registrations charged to recipients or sponsoring agencies, while approximately another third of the needed funds are allocated from the annual operating budget. The remainder of the funds come from various combinations of government contracts or grants (federal, state, or municipal), from special state appropriations and/or from foundations.

Several questions related to the distribution of financial resources within colleges and universities. They were intended to reveal the extent to which institutions used discretionary moneys (for example, indirect cost returns on federal grants and contracts, funds generated in excess of expenses on conferences and workshops) or financial incentives for academic public-service activities. As shown in Table 3, when academic public-service programs generate funds in excess of income, the additional funds are occasionally reinvested in future public-service programs. Equally typically, however, such funds are contributed to the institutional general fund. AASCU institutions do not typically allocate indirect cost funds derived from grants and contracts to public-service programs. AASCU institutions do use financial incentives, however, to promote the public-service function. More than

Table 3. Organizational Arrangements for Service in AASCU Institutions

	Number of Institutions N = 255	*Percent of Total*
1. Administration of public-service programs is a part-time responsibility of an individual administrator with institution-wide responsibilities.	161	63
2. Governance committees with institution-wide responsibility for recommending policy for academic public service programs	47	20
3. Academic support services used frequently by public-service programs:		
• conference facilities	170	67
• secretariat assistance	133	52
• library reference	130	51
• assistance of campus grants officer	124	49
• media center	106	42
• information system concerning external fund support	106	42
• campus press/printing	106	42
• college vehicles	81	38
4. Sources of support for public-service programs:		
• service fees/subscriptions, etc.		33
• college operating budget		33
• variable combinations of federal grants/contacts contracts for services to state and local governments special state appropriation foundation grants		33
5. Financial incentives for service programs		
• distribution of funds in excess of expenses		
—reinvested in public-service programs	99	39
—to general fund for all programs	78	31
•reallocates to public-service programs some portion of indirect costs from outside grants and contracts:		
—yes	57	22
—no	193	76
•productivity in public service considered substitute for publication in promotion and tenure decision.	130	51

Organizational Differences Associated With Public-Service Emphasis

The second major objective of the study was to identify organizational differences associated with the degree of emphasis on academic public service as an institutional mission. Smith wanted to see what particular aspects of structure or program or policy uniquely characterized institutions emphasizing public service. As a first step in this analysis, Smith divided all respondents into two groups on the basis of a pattern of response to three items. The first item asked respondents to indicate whether academic public service was recognized as an institutional responsibility in the formal mission statement. The second item requested respondents to indicate the position of academic public service in relation to teaching and research; that is, whether the academic public service function was considered "integral" or "subordinate." The third item requested respondents to describe the institutional leadership posture toward academic public service as an institutional responsibility—whether the leadership expressed interest, encouraged faculty involvement, or initiated organizational changes to accommodate the academic public-service function. The first group of institutions in the study included, for analytical purposes, all those institutions that recognized academic public service as an institutional responsibility in the mission statement, *and* regarded service as an "integral" function along with teaching and research, *and* whose leadership initiated organizational arrangements to accommodate it. Smith labeled this group "SCU2s"—those institutions placing greater emphasis on academic public service as an institutional responsibility. One hundred and three institutions formed this subset (approximately 40 percent of the student participants). All other respondents—152 institutions, or approximately 60 percent—formed the second group—"SCU1s"—those institutions placing less emphasis on academic public service as an institutional mission.

Modal Differences

The second step in Smith's analysis involved comparing the responses of the two subsets of institutions to questionnaire items on program and organizational variables in order to draw inferences about organizational differences associated with accommodation to academic public service. He looked first for differences in response modes to see whether there were institutional differences in the basic patterns and practices that relate to the degree

of emphasis on public service in institutional mission. Smith found only four areas of difference in the modal responses between the group placing less emphasis on service (SCU1s) and that placing greater emphasis on service (SCU2s). These four areas provide the most reliable inferences about organizational variables that can be associated with degree of emphasis on public service.

The first area was participation in consortial arrangements with other higher education institutions, government agencies, or other community organizations having a public-service function. On this item, the modal response for the "greater emphasis" institutions was one of participation. Seventy percent of this group participate in consortial arrangements having a public-service function. The response for the other group, however, was bimodal. Only 53 percent of the institutions in the "less emphasis" group participate in consortial activities. Chi-square analysis of the proportional differences yielded significance at the .01 level. Thus, those institutions emphasizing public service as an institutional mission are more likely to engage in consortial arrangements oriented toward public service.

The modal responses from the two groups also differed on the question about the frequency of use of academic support services for public-service activities. Those institutions with a strong emphasis on public service indicated that nine out of the ten support services listed by Smith were frequently used in support of public-service programs. The "lesser emphasis" institutions, in contrast, provided bimodal responses indicating infrequent use as often as frequent use for six of the ten services. Those institutions with a stronger service emphasis are more likely to support it with the following academic support services: conference/training facilities, media center, campus press and printing facilities, library services, college vehicles, secretarial/clerical assistance, information on research/program development funds, and the assistance of the campus grants administrator. (In these eight areas the proportional differences between the two groups responses were statistically significant at least to the .05 level.) The Smith study does not indicate how the work of these service units is distributed between academic instructional support and public-service support, but it does show that institutions with a public-service emphasis, as a matter of policy, allow their support services to be used frequently for public-service activities.

In two of the items on the financing of public-service activities, there were differences in the response modes between those institutions placing a greater emphasis on public service and those

placing less. "Service emphasis" colleges and universities were more likely to provide seed-grant funds to faculty or staff members for developing public-service programming. For this item, the modal response for the group of institutions emphasizing public service was to provide seed grants, while the response of the other group was bimodal—half providing seed grants and half not. (The proportional differences proved to be statistically significant at the .01 level.)

For the distribution of funds generated in excess of expenses for public-service programs, the typical (modal) response for institutions emphasizing public service was to reinvest such funds in future public-service programs. In contrast, institutions placing less emphasis on public service were as likely to credit such excess funds to the general fund for reallocation to all programs as to reinvest them in public-service activities. (Despite modal differences, however, the proportional differences between the two groups were not found to be statistically significant.)

For all other questionnaire items, there were no differences between the modal responses of the two groups of institutions. The findings suggest that there are few differences in organizational patterns, structures, and policies between the more service-oriented institutions and the less service oriented and, therefore, that the degree of emphasis on public service contributes little to the explanation of organizational and structural differences among colleges and universities.

Proportional Differences

After examining the modal differences between the two groups of institutions, Smith looked for proportional differences in the frequency responses and tested them for statistical significance using chi-square analysis. Statistically significant proportional differences do not allow for casual interpretations, but they do suggest that more institutions emphasizing public service are characterized by this policy or that program/practice than are those institutions not emphasizing public service. Although this does not prove any inherent relationship between mission and goal posture and structural/organizational variables, it is possible to get some idea of the policies and practices likely to be found in institutions emphasizing service. This information can be useful to institutions wishing to strengthen their public-service emphasis. Table 4 shows the proportional differences between the two groups of institutions and the results of chi-square tests for all items statistically significant at the .05 level or better.

Table 4.
Proportional Response Differences Among AASCU Institutions

	Lesser-emphasis SCU1s		*Greater-emphasis SCU2s*		*Chi Square Value*	*Sig. Level*	*Degrees of Freedom*
	N (152)	*% (of 152)*	*N (103)*	*% (of 103)*			
1. Participates in consortia	81	53	72	70	7.900	.01	1
2. Academic support services regularly used:							
• conference training	92	60	78	—	9.153	.05	3
• media center	53	35	53	51	43.954	.001	3
• campus press/printing	49	32	57	55	17.371	.001	3
• library services	68	45	62	60	9.042	.02	2
• college vehicles	36	24	45	44	15.026	.01	3
• secretary/clerical	61	40	72	70	21.516	.001	3
• help with research program development	53	35	53	51	10.092	.001	3
• help with grants and contracts	57	38	67	65	13.814	.01	3
3. Seed grants for public service	74	49	69	67	8.992	.01	1
4. • No formal criteria for service	112	74	59	57	—	—	–
• Formal criteria for service	40	26	44	43	7.472	.01	1
5. "Major" factors in decision on public-service projects:							
• compatibility with institutional mission	123	81	96	93	8.539	.02	2
• capability to produce successful results	114	75	94	91	9.901	.001	2

6. Auspices for student participation							
• academic department policy	71	47	35	34	18.876	.001	3
• individual faculty interest	35	23	29	28	18.876	.001	3
• institution-wide policy	25	16	22	21	18.876	.001	3
• major subdivision policy	18	12	16	16	18.876	.001	3
7. Number of special-purpose units							
• 0	40	26	15	15	7.815	.05	3
• 1-5	78	51	54	52	7.815	.05	3
• 6-10	13	9	15	15	7.815	.05	3
• 11 +	3	3	9	9	7.815	.05	3
Number of "Standard" Units							
• 1-5	48	32	49	48	14.774	.001	2
• 6-10	2	1	6	6	14.774	.001	2
8. Committees with institution-wide responsibility for recommending public-service policy	45	27	47	46	7.068	.01	1
9. Reallocates some portion of indirect costs on outside grants and contracts to public service	27	18	30	29	3.841	.05	1
10. Provides release time for public service	94	62	82	80	9.472	.01	1
11. Importance of public-service productivity as a "major" factor in employment decisions	24	16	29	28	6.802	.05	2

In addition to the proportional differences related to participation in consortia, provision of academic support services, and availability of seed grants for the faculty and staff already mentioned, there are eleven program or policy areas in which the two groups of institutions noticeably differ. Although more than half of the institutions in both groups have not established formal criteria for involvement in service projects, a notably larger proportion of "service emphasis" institutions do have formal criteria. In decisions on whether to undertake public-service projects, institutions emphasizing public service are more likely to take into consideration both compatibility of the service project with institutional mission and institutional capability to produce successful results.

Although the majority of both groups of institutions considered student involvement in public-service programs a matter of departmental policy, a larger proportion of the "service emphasis" institutions placed student participation under the auspices of institution-wide policy mandates or under a major subdivision level (such as the college of arts and sciences).

Approximately half the colleges and universities in both categories have between one and five special-purpose centers, institutes, or bureaus for the purpose of delivering public service. Institutions placing a greater emphasis on public service, however, are more likely to have established greater numbers of special-purpose units while more "lesser emphasis" institutions are likely to have established no special-purpose service units. Perhaps more tellingly, the institutions emphasizing public service are more likely to have centers, institutes, and bureaus of the "standard" type with a permanent professional staff, a managerial hierarchy, a central office for its exclusive use, and an annual operating budget. (Proportional differences for the "adaptive" and "shadow" types were not significant.)

Although neither group of institutions was likely to have a formal governance committee to recommend policy or programs in public service, a significantly larger proportion of the institutions placing greater emphasis on public service did have a committee to recommend policy on an institution-wide basis. (Differences at the subdivision, departmental, or special-purpose unit levels were not statistically significant.)

As noted earlier, colleges and universities emphasizing on public service were more likely to reinvest funds generated in excess of costs in public-service programs and activities than were "lesser emphasis" institutions. The latter group deposited such funds in the general fund for use in all types of activities. The patterns

differed somewhat, however, in the reallocation of funds generated as indirect cost returns from outside grants and contracts. The majority of institutions in both groups did not reallocate such overhead funds to public-service programs. A larger proportion of institutions placing an emphasis on service, however, did reallocate some portion of such funds toward public-service programming.

Although both groups of institutions provide release time and/or reductions in teaching load for faculty members for involvement in public-service activities, institutions in the category emphasizing service were proportionally more likely to do so. It must be remembered, however, that a policy allowing release time for public-service activity does not guarantee that faculty members will use it in this way. The Smith study does not reveal about the extent of use in AASCU institutions.

In personnel decisions, it has been noted that in all types of decisions (i.e., employment, promotion, tenure, and salary) the majority of both groups of institutions consider public service of minor imnportance. Analysis of those institutions considering public-service productivity a major factor in personnel decisions, however, revealed significant proportional differences between the two groups of institutions only in the category of employment decisions. Institutions emphasizing public service are more likely to consider productivity in public service as a major factor in employment decisions. Proportional differences for service productivity as a major factor in promotion, tenure, and salary decisions were not significant.

Similarities

For many questionnaire items, Smith found neither modal nor significant proportional differences between the two subsets of respondents. The two groups of institutions were similar in the frequency with which

- staff and faculty interests or community pressures and demands figured as considerations in decisions to undertake academic public-service programs;
- certain types of special purpose units—e.g., "shadow" and "adaptive" institutes or centers—were established for the delivery of academic public services;
- academic public service productivity advantaged faculty members in such personnel decisions as promotion in rank and salary increase, and award of tenure;
- academic public-service productivity could be substituted for publication in promotion and tenure decisions; and

- sabbatical leave could be awarded for participation in academic public-service activity.

Both groups of institutions were similar, as well, in the average number of days (four per month) faculty members were permitted for consultation independent of institutionally sponsored public-service programs.

Strategies for a Stronger Service Orientation

The Smith findings indicate that most AASCU colleges and universities recognize public service as an important part of their mission and consider service integral to teaching and scholarship. The leadership in most institutions emphasizes the public-service mission and encourages the faculty and staff to engage in public-service activities. Institutions have established a variety of policies and programs for the delivery of such services.

AASCU colleges and universities differ in how the public-service mission is conceived and carried out, but the differences relate more to matters of *degree* of involvement than to basic differences in organization, structure, policy, or program. Thus it is not very useful to construct different "models" or sets of institutions with clearly distinct organizational patterns, policies, and practices corresponding to different orientations to public service. It is more useful to think in terms of a *continuum*. Colleges and universities that emphasize service as a mission can be clustered at one end of the continuum. These institutions have somewhat more clearly delineated criteria for public-service activities, they use more academic support services to carry out their public-service mission, and they have developed some fiscal incentives (release time, return of revenues to service programs) to encourage the faculty and staff to undertake such service. At the other end of the continuum are colleges and universities that also have a stated mission of public service and are involved with many service activities and programs. These institutions emphasize their service mission and activities to a somewhat lesser degree, however. They offer somewhat fewer incentives and support services for public service.

The findings of the Smith study, then, present a picture of the current status of public service in AASCU institutions but provide no clear models of the ideal service-oriented institution and no easy recipes for adjusting policies and practices in order to improve or enhance the public-service mission in higher education. However, a look at the patterns and practices that characterize the "service emphasis" institutions suggests ideas that can serve as a useful starting point for institutional self-examination.

The Smith findings suggest the following recommendations for institutions that wish to improve their public service.

1. Provide leadership.

Although many AASCU institutions have obviously recognized the need for leadership, the notion cannot be overstressed. It is important for those persons already involved in public-service programming, as well as for faculty and staff members considering service, to know that the chief executive officers of their institution view public service as a major institutional responsibility and commitment. It is especially important because traditional wisdom usually places public service at the bottom of the pecking order. Leadership in this sense implies not only a willingness to state publicly or reaffirm institutional priorities but also an active concern about the function of public service and a willingness to examine structures, policies, and practices. In a sense, leaders must feel as accountable for public-service delivery as they do for teaching and scholarship.

2. Develop and promulgate a statement on public-service policy for the institution.

Colleges and universities interested in reinvigorating the public-service mission might consider the development of a formal institutional statement or policy document on public service. Ideally, the statement would not only articulate the mission and function of public service but also address such matters as the forms of service considered appropriate or important, the kinds of problems and concerns addressed through public services, the external groups or agencies considered important partners for service, and the formal criteria to be used in making decisions about public-service programs. The development of such a statement through normal governance channels would allow for healthy debate among the faculty and staff. Ideally, the public-service statement would build on each institution's unique characteristics, perspectives, and abilities to provide service.

Once developed, the public-service policy statement could help colleges and universities communicate with external audiences and potential service partners. Internally, it will let faculty and staff members know what kinds of activities are consistent with institutional purposes and values. This does not mean, of course, that colleges and universities should be overly prescriptive. Most of them will continue to allow faculty members to make individual decisions about their professional activities. A formal statement will allow, however, for clarification and encouragement rather than prescription.

3. Invest in the service mission.

Although the lion's share of institutional resources will naturally be devoted to instruction and/or scholarship, it is appropriate for many institutions to invest in the service mission as well. The Smith study shows that institutions emphasizing public service find ways of making financial investments in their public-service programs—through the creation of special institutes, centers, and bureaus; through the reinvestment of resources accrued by the institution as excess funds for sponsored service activities; through the allocation of overhead funds from grants and contracts to service activities. Often a small financial investment serves as a strong incentive for increasing service activity. The investment in public service often brings financial returns in the form of external support for specific activities, but the less-direct benefits, such as better community relations and a more positive public image, are equally important.

4. Reward public-service activity.

The findings of the Smith study suggest that most AASCU institutions have not found an effective way to integrate public service into the faculty reward system. This is a problem common to all institutions of higher education. Nevertheless, if AASCU institutions continue to rely on faculty members for the bulk of their public-service activities, it will be important to find ways to reward faculty members for their contributions. Colleges and universities may wish to consider creating faculty committees to work on this problem and make institution-specific recommendations.

5. Make an organizational commitment to the service mission.

Although elaborate, separate structures for public service are not essential to the success of the public-service mission in higher education, it is important to have some clearly delineated organizational arrangements and policies for the delivery of public services. The Smith study shows that most AASCU institutions have an administrative officer with institution-wide, part-time responsibilities for the public-service function. It also shows that those institutions emphasizing public service seek out partnerships and/or consortial arrangements with other organizations, create more campus centers and institutes established expressly for service, and expect academic support services to support the public-service function. Less clear from the Smith findings, however, is the level of organizational and policy coherence among AASCU institutions in the public-service mission. Many organi-

zational structures, policies, and arrangements for public service appear to have developed rather haphazardly over the years, and the practices of a given institution may not be consistent with its formal statements and policies.

It is time for a reexamination of the organizational structures and policies that govern the ways public service is organized and delivered by institutions of higher education. Such reexamination is best accomplished by each institution individually.

American Association
of State Colleges and Universities

One Dupont Circle/Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-7070

Allan W. Ostar
President